



## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/862,523	05/22/2001	Steven Derrick Clynes	TI-32423	1218	
23494	7590 12/23/2005		EXAMINER		
TEXAS INSTRUMENTS INCORPORATED			MOE, AUNG SOE		
P O BOX 655	5474, M/S 3999				
DALLAS, TX 75265			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2685		
			DATE MAIL ED: 12/23/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)			
09/862,523	CLYNES ET AL.	CLYNES ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit			
Aung S. Moe	2685			

	Aung S. Moe	2685	
-The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with	the correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 06 December 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION	ON FOR ALLOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	ving replies: (1) an amendme tice of Appeal (with appeal fe se with 37 CFR 1.114. The re	nt, affidavit, or other evider e) in compliance with 37 C	rce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or ( TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 76	dvisory Action, or (2) the date se ater than SIX MONTHS from the b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHE	mailing date of the final rejecti	on.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 C tension and the corresponding ar thortened statutory period for rep than three months after the mail	nount of the fee. The appropri ly originally set in the final Offi	ate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(	e)), to avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of e appeal. Since
<ul> <li>3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE beloe) (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or</li> <li>(d) They present additional claims without canceling a second content of the content of</li></ul>	nsideration and/or search (se w); ter form for appeal by materia	e NOTE below); ally reducing or simplifying	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).  4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.15  5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)	21. See attached Notice of No		(PTOL-324).
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s).		•	•
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1,3-13,17,18 and 20. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		☑ will be entered and an e	explanation of
<ul> <li>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</li> <li>8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good anwas not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ul>	t before or on the date of filing d sufficient reasons why the a	g a Notice of Appeal will <u>no</u> iffidavit or other evidence is	ot be entered s necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under and was not earlier presente	appeal and/or appellant fai ed. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(	ls to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•	
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See attached.</li> </ol>			nce because:
<ul><li>12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).</li><li>13.  Other:</li></ul>	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Pa	aper No(s)	

## Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 12/06/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In the remarks filed on 12/06/2006, the Applicant alleged that Chen '578 doe not discloses or suggest the presently claimed invention including "detecting the lowest pixel value among the adjacent pixels in independent claims 1 and 7, and the Applicant further stated that "element A, B, and C refer to luminance value, and not <u>pixel values</u>, thus, does not disclose determining the lowest <u>pixel."</u>

In response, the Examiner respectfully disagrees because Chen '578 clearly discloses in Figs. 3a-3j, how to determining the lowest <u>pixel</u> value (i.e., "Figures 3a through 3j, each drawing illustrates a group of three neighboring pixels in the image signal. The pixels are illustrated as bars, . . . see col. 6, lines 30+". In col. 8, lines 30+, Chen '578 stated "mode, and feeds the pixel value to a comparator 82 . . .") among the adjacent pixels. In particular, Chen '578 stated in col. 6, lines 29+ that in Fig. 3a, and Pixel value of pixel B52 is greater than that of the pixel values of pixel A50 and the pixel value of the pixel C54 is greater than that of the pixel value of Pixel B52, thus, it is cleared that the pixel value of A50 is determined to be the lowest among the adjacent pixel B52 and C54.

In addition, Chen '578 clearly discloses that the image sensor 6 generates the pixel values as shown in Figs. 3a-3j. In particular, a plurality of pixels within a block (i.e., see Figs. 4A-4C and 6), designating a pixel as a process pixel (i.e., see Fig. 2, the elements 22, 24 and 32, and comparing the process (i.e., Fig. 2, the element 34) **pixel value** to at least one adjacent **pixel** 

Art Unit: 2685

value (col. 8, lines 30+). In view of this, it is cleared that Chen does in fact show the present claimed invention as required, and the Examiner will maintain the previous Final Office.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aung S. Moe whose telephone number is 571-272-7314. The examiner can normally be reached on Flex.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward F. Urban can be reached on 571-272-7899. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Aung S. Moe Primary Examiner

A. Moe December 14, 2005